Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-288001 / US5290/5981

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Shunpei Yamazaki Art Unit: 2632

Serial No.: 10/016,224 Examiner: Son M. Tang Filed: November 1, 2001 Confirmation No.: 2987

Title : DISPLAY DEVICE AND VEHICLE

## **MAIL STOP AF**

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## REPLY TO ACTION OF NOVEMBER 17, 2005

Claims 3-17 and 24-68 are pending in the application, with claims 3-16 being independent<sup>1</sup>.

Independent claims 3-6, along with their dependent claims 25, 26, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37 and 38, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Bauer (U.S. Patent No. 6,509,832) in view of Zhang (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,107). Claims 24, 28, 32 and 36, which depend from claims 3-6, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of Zhang and Gauthier (U.S. Patent No. 5,303,205).

Claims 3-6 each recite a vehicle having a display device mounted on a side (claims 3 and 5) or back (claims 4 and 6) mirror that includes "a substrate, a first thin film transistor formed over the substrate, a pixel electrode electrically connected to the first thin film transistor and a driver circuit comprising a second thin film transistor formed over the substrate and operationally connected to the first thin film transistor." Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 3-6, and their dependent claims, because the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness based on Bauer, Zhang, and Gauthier.

Bauer describes a vehicle monitoring system having a display device 32 that includes a display 100. While Bauer describes the display 100 as possibly being implemented using a CRT, a back lit liquid crystal display or a heads-up display, Bauer does not describe or suggest a display that includes the structure recited in claims 3-6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Applicant submits that claims 18-23 were canceled in the response to the Office Action mailed on June 25, 2005. The "Office Action Summary" and the "Detailed Action" sections of the Final Office Action, however, indicate that the cancellation of claims 18-23 has not been entered. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the cancellation of claims 18-23 be entered.